

Summary of Proposed Plans Submitted by Public (July 12, 2011)

REVISED DRAFT

Plan ID	Plan Title (Proposer)	Pop. Dev.	RDUs/ Comm Moved	Comm Split	Voter Adv/Def	# of People Moved	Sup. Moved	CVAP NH White					CVAP Hispanic					CVAP African American					CVAP Asian				
								1ST	2ND	3RD	4TH	5TH	1st	2ND	3RD	4TH	5TH	1ST	2ND	3RD	4TH	5TH	1ST	2ND	3RD	4TH	5TH
A1	Benchmark	9.97%	N/A	38	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.0%	17.3%	59.5%	41.8%	50.6%	63.3%	33.6%	23.8%	31.6%	24.7%	3.6%	36.5%	5.0%	7.8%	6.8%	18.2%	10.5%	10.3%	16.9%	16.5%
	Proposed Amended A1	1.69%	57/6	35	39,520/ 110,601	150,121	None	14.5%	17.3%	59.5%	41.4%	52.0%	62.1%	33.6%	23.8%	32.2%	23.5%	3.7%	36.5%	5.0%	7.7%	6.9%	18.8%	10.5%	10.3%	16.8%	16.0%
B1	Minority Empowerment (Alan Chan)	1.32%	430/48	18	680,710/ 749,836	1,454,997	None	21.0%	14.9%	59.2%	40.7%	51.5%	43.0%	40.1%	24.0%	36.3%	27.7%	4.6%	35.4%	4.9%	7.6%	7.8%	30.3%	7.7%	10.4%	13.4%	11.4%
C1	Plan (John Purpura)	0.08%	1079/130	22	1,587,230/ 1,650,759	3,723,924	GM to D3	27.0%	9.1%	61.8%	38.7%	49.6%	42.7%	47.4%	18.4%	34.2%	30.2%	3.4%	34.7%	5.5%	10.2%	8.0%	25.7%	7.3%	12.7%	14.8%	10.6%
D1	C Plan 1 (Yoav Shernock)	0.07%	144/23	33	181,358/ 244,465	494,018	None	15.7%	18.1%	59.8%	40.7%	51.7%	56.9%	33.3%	23.6%	34.9%	24.6%	3.6%	35.8%	5.0%	7.8%	7.0%	22.7%	10.7%	10.2%	14.5%	15.1%
F1	Even Plan (Christopher McClelland)	0.15%	81/14	38	72,487/ 134,651	210,828	None	14.4%	17.4%	59.4%	41.7%	52.3%	62.2%	33.8%	23.9%	32.0%	23.2%	3.6%	36.3%	5.0%	7.7%	6.9%	18.8%	10.4%	10.3%	16.6%	16.2%
G1	First Plan (Daniel Lopez)	1.71%	532/64	7	659,426/ 700,611	1,743,300	GM to D5	18.1%	25.4%	59.7%	34.0%	51.4%	54.5%	30.2%	22.9%	39.1%	25.1%	3.7%	32.8%	5.0%	10.1%	7.1%	22.7%	9.7%	11.0%	14.6%	14.9%
H2	LA_CO_BOS_06_01_2011 (Leo Estrada)	5.79%	1171/138	35	1,447,782/ 1,517,053	3,879,240	None	22.5%	16.9%	67.6%	25.1%	49.8%	50.2%	32.3%	14.9%	50.1%	28.9%	8.0%	36.6%	4.4%	4.2%	6.7%	18.2%	11.7%	11.5%	19.2%	13.1%
I1	Coastal City- Foothill Community Realignment (Christopher Kan)	0.40%	1198/156	30	1,388,910/ 1,453,710	4,124,574	MDA to D3; DK to D5	30.7%	8.9%	59.6%	51.7%	36.2%	39.2%	50.7%	20.9%	21.4%	41.1%	4.9%	33.2%	5.6%	10.1%	6.9%	23.9%	5.7%	12.4%	14.4%	14.3%
J1	LA_CO_BOS_06_06_2011 (Leo Estrada)	0.23%	1175/142	36	1,339,386/ 1,403,732	3,867,242	None	24.2%	16.7%	68.0%	25.3%	49.1%	51.1%	32.5%	14.4%	50.0%	27.9%	6.4%	36.7%	4.4%	4.4%	7.5%	17.1%	11.6%	11.6%	19.0%	13.9%
K1	Privett1 (Keith Privett)	0.06%	575/95	50	705,288/ 767,641	1,949,622	None	15.8%	26.4%	63.0%	33.1%	49.2%	54.9%	29.9%	19.5%	39.5%	29.5%	5.2%	31.7%	4.8%	8.0%	7.5%	23.0%	10.0%	11.2%	17.5%	12.3%
L1	Redistricting LA County 2011 (Seyou Oh)	0.28%	676/96	33	921,514/ 984,854	2,216,138	None	19.3%	20.4%	59.2%	39.2%	50.4%	48.7%	39.0%	22.2%	34.0%	27.7%	3.9%	33.2%	5.3%	9.5%	7.6%	27.0%	5.7%	11.9%	15.1%	12.7%
M1	Joseph M. Sanchez Memorial Plan (Clayton/ Wong)	0.50%	1116/125	16	1,179,926/ 1,238,198	3,705,510	None	29.8%	14.2%	64.8%	26.3%	48.4%	52.6%	36.5%	14.4%	50.5%	23.1%	4.8%	37.1%	6.8%	4.6%	7.1%	11.6%	10.1%	12.2%	17.3%	19.9%
N1	Velasquez/ Clayton - Plan 2 (Clayton/ Velasquez)	0.48%	1079/129	19	1,113,283/ 1,173,877	3,709,676	None	28.3%	11.2%	66.7%	26.5%	48.4%	53.9%	37.5%	13.8%	50.0%	23.1%	5.3%	38.5%	5.8%	4.7%	7.1%	11.3%	10.5%	11.9%	17.4%	19.9%
O1	Reed Plan (James Reed)	0.42%	967/123	42	1,348,885/ 1,418,654	3,359,943	GM to D3	19.7%	7.7%	54.5%	54.2%	48.2%	54.3%	47.3%	24.8%	19.5%	28.8%	3.8%	36.4%	5.6%	9.1%	7.5%	21.1%	7.1%	13.6%	15.0%	14.0%
P1	Plan 1 (Ron Hoffman)	0.11%	1015/127	8	1,476,081/ 1,538,744	3,368,821	None	23.1%	11.9%	66.0%	33.6%	50.3%	50.8%	38.7%	13.6%	39.7%	30.9%	3.6%	37.0%	5.4%	8.0%	7.0%	21.4%	10.4%	13.4%	16.8%	10.3%
Q1	MALDEF Submission 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	GM to B; MRT to C; ZY/DK/MDA to Unassigned	(A) 21.0%	(B) 28.6%)	(C) 18.3%	N/A	N/A	(A) 57.6%	(B) 51.7%	(C) 32.8%	N/A	N/A	(A) 4.8%	(B) 6.5%	(C) 35.2%	N/A	N/A	(A) 15.4%	(B) 12.0%	(C) 11.4%	N/A	N/A
R1	MALDEF Submission 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	GM to B; MRT to C; ZY/DK/MDA to Unassigned	(A) 21.6%	(B) 29.0%)	(C) 18.2%	N/A	N/A	(A) 56.8%	(B) 51.7%	(C) 33.2%	N/A	N/A	(A) 4.8%	(B) 6.4%	(C) 35.4%	N/A	N/A	(A) 15.6%	(B) 11.7%	(C) 10.8%	N/A	N/A
S1	LACBOS African American	0.57%	1003/129	34	1,041,459/ 1,105,346	3,350,488	None	28.7%	16.5%	65.9%	22.9%	49.2%	53.2%	34.9%	14.2%	52.0%	23.3%	4.8%	36.2%	6.1%	6.1%	6.8%	12.1%	10.3%	12.0%	17.6%	19.3%
	Proposed Amended S1	2.81%	1010/128	34	1,066,524/ 1,157,632	3,375,553	None	28.7%	17.2%	65.1%	22.9%	49.2%	53.2%	33.7%	15.2%	52.0%	23.3%	4.8%	36.5%	6.1%	6.1%	6.8%	12.1%	10.5%	11.9%	17.6%	19.3%

# **BOUNDARY REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED REDISTRICTING PLANS**

## **Types of Changes In Proposed Plans**

- ☐ Population deviation
- ☐ Movement of major facilities in districts
- ☐ Geographic changes
- ☐ Splits of political subdivisions/communities of interest
- ☐ Ethnic/minority group balances among the districts
- ☐ Voter deferral or advancement
- ☐ Incumbent displacement

## **Types of Plans**

- ☐ Minimal Changes
- ☐ Small Changes
- ☐ Large Changes
- ☐ Extremely Large Changes

## **Guidelines for Reviewing Proposals** (not listed in any particular order of importance)

All plans must have 5 Supervisorial Districts.

The Committee should consider all of the criteria set forth below.

The Committee should select plans for further consideration based on a balancing of these criteria.

- ☐ Keep total population deviation as nearly equal in population as may be.
- ☐ Keep districts contiguous and reasonably compact.
- ☐ Take into account the topography and geography of the districts.
- ☐ Consider VRA Section 2 compliance, but avoid using race as the predominant factor.
- ☐ Avoid splitting Redistricting Units (RDUs) whenever possible.
- ☐ Avoid splitting cities / unincorporated areas whenever possible.
- ☐ Avoid splitting communities of interest, neighborhoods, or groups that have a clear identity.
- ☐ Attempt to preserve core populations of the districts.
- ☐ Avoid displacing large segments of populations into different districts.
- ☐ Avoid voter confusion.
- ☐ Avoid displacing any Supervisor's residence from his/her district.